Joint Centre for Mesoscale Meteorology, Reading, UK

Short period forecasting of catchment-scale precipitation
Part 1: The role of Numerical Weather Prediction

A. J. Thorpe
M. Haile
M. A. Pedder

Internal Report No. 77

September 1997

Met Office Joint Centre for Mesoscale Meteorology Department of Meteorology
University of Reading PO Box 243 Reading RG6 6BB United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)118 931 8425 Fax: +44 (0)118 931 8791
www.metoffice.com

Designed and produced by the Met Office © Crown copyright 2001 01/0240 The Met Office logo is a registered trademark.

Short period forecasting of catchment-scale precipitation. Part I : the role of Numerical Weather Prediction

M.A.Pedder, M.Haile and A.J.Thorpe

Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, Reading RG6 6BB, UK

Corresponding author: *Dr M A Pedder, Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, Reading RG6 6BB, UK.*

ABSTRACT

A deterministic forecast of surface precipitation involves solving a time-dependent moisture balance equation satisfying conservation of total water substance. A realistic solution needs to take into account feedback between atmospheric dynamics and the diabatic sources of heat energy associated with phase changes, as well as complex microphysical processes controlling the conversion between cloud water (or ice) and precipitation. Such processes are taken into account either explicitly or via physical parameterisation schemes in many operational numerical weather prediction models, which can therefore generate precipitation forecasts which are fully consistent with the predicted evolution of the atmospheric state as measured by observations of temperature, wind, pressure and humidity.

This paper reviews briefly the atmospheric moisture balance equation and how it may be solved in practice. We present solutions obtained using the Meteorological Office Mesoscale version of its operational Unified numerical weather prediction (NWP) model, and verify predicted precipitation rates against catchment-scale values based on observations collected during an Intensive Observation Period (IOP) of HYREX. Results highlight some limitations of an operational NWP forecast in providing adequate time and space resolution, and its sensitivity to initial conditions. It is argued that the large-scale model forecast can nevertheless provide important information about the moist dynamical environment which could be usefully incorporated into a higher resolution, 'storm-resolving' prediction scheme.

Precipitation forecasting; moisture budget; numerical weather prediction

1. Introduction

The problem of flood forecasting requires accurate and timely predictions of the precipitation affecting a given catchment area. Appropriate lead times for such forecasts range from of order one hour to a day or more. The research reported here and in Bell and Moore (1997) considers how these requirements might be satisfied using deterministic methods of rainfall prediction, based on both operational numerical weather prediction (NWP) and 'catchment-scale' model formulations. The ultimate objective of the research is to develop a system for predicting catchment-scale rainfall events using a high resolution forecast scheme which can incorporate information from an operational mesoscale forecast model as well as 'observations' such as measured surface weather parameters and radar reflectivity data.

Given that other approaches are being studied within HYREX it is worthwhile summarizing here the principles which lie behind NWP. The deterministic approach takes as its basis the idea that at least over a certain time-period the laws of physics, as applied to the atmosphere, can be solved (integrated forward in time) to find the forecast fields given initial data describing the current conditions. The time-period over which such forecasts are accurate depends on the spatial scale of the phenomenon of interest. In the case of local rainfall it is believed that the atmosphere is predictable or 'deterministic' for up to a few hours ahead. However, one problem with this approach is the accurate specification of the initial state, which is generally under-determined by observations. NWP models attempt to overcome that problem by combining the information available from observations with data generated from a short-range forecast (initialised at some earlier time); a process generally referred to as *data assimilation*. Data assimilation by NWP provides a very effective method for estimating the current state of the atmosphere in a way which ensures that the relationships between the various fields represented by the model are consistent with the physical laws assumed by the model. Nevertheless, uncertainty in the determination of an initial state is still one of the main sources of error in short-term weather forecasting.

A new development in deterministic weather prediction is the idea of starting a set of forecast integrations from slightly different initial conditions, reflecting the range of uncertainty in the estimated initial state. This *ensemble* approach allows a probability to be assigned to the liklehood of rainfall (for example). Although we do not consider the ensemble approach here (and it has yet to be applied to mesoscale systems) it is generally accepted as the way forward for NWP, particularly in generating probability forecasts. To make the distinction between this and other purely statistically-based methods (such as described in other HYREX sub-projects) we should regard such an ensemble approach as still conforming to a deterministic methodology.

Accurate prediction of regional precipitation by deterministic methods is perhaps the most difficult problem in modern weather forecasting. Recent studies using regional NWP models have demonstrated some skill in forecasting rainfall for hydrological purposes, at least on relatively large scales (Karstens et al., 1993; Heise, 1996), but performance so far falls far short of the requirements for successful flood forecasting on any significant lead time. Furthermore, operational NWP models do not provide the spatial resolution required to represent the substantial variations of precipitation which can occur within a single catchment, and which may be very important for determining catchment response. For short-term precipitation forecasting, a few schemes have been developed which attempt to combine information from a NWP model with near real time data in order to predict the movement and intensity of precipitation systems on scales below those explicitely resolved by the model. In Britain, the Meteorological Office NIMROD system, which has recently replaced its FRONTIERS system (Brown *et al.*, 1994; Golding, 1997), uses an objective prediction method which combines information from a short term forecast provided by an operational mesoscale NWP model with radar and satellite data in order to generate high-resolution forecasts of cloud and precipitation patterns on lead times of a few hours. Such a scheme is intended to apply over a relatively large area on a routine (operational) basis. It relies heavily on the principle of advecting individual precipitation features which have been identified from radar and satellite data, while the temporal evolution of individual 'storms' is taken into account more-or-less

empirically. However, such a scheme is not primarily intended to provide predictions of catchment-scale precipitation in a form suitable for quantitative flood forecasting.

The remainder of this paper outlines some general principles of precipitation forecasting by deterministic methods before describing briefly the role and performance of an operational, mesoscale NWP system. Here and in the following, the term *mesoscale* is used to refer to a range of space and time scales intermediate between the large scale global circulation and the small-scale of (for example) individual clouds. It implies a spatial resolution of a few tens of kilometres and a temporal resolution of the order of one thousand seconds.) A following paper (Bell and Moore, 1997) describes the development and application of a "water-balance storm model", which is intended to provide a much higher time and space resolution than that available from the mesoscale model.

2. The atmospheric moisture budget

A crucial requirement for the successful forecasting of surface precipitation is an accurate representation of the time evolution of atmospheric sources and sinks of precipitable water. This is equivalent to solving a time-dependent moisture budget equation, which can be written:

$$P - E = -\frac{D\left(\bar{q} + \bar{l}\right)}{Dt} \tag{1}$$

Here the overbar symbol is used to denote mass-weighted vertical integration over a full atmospheric column with unit horizontal area and D/Dt is the so-called total or substantial time derivative; q is specific humidity (vapour concentration), l the specific liquid (or solid) water concentration, P the surface precipitation rate and E the surface evaporation. In terms of parameters which can be evaluated in a local frame of reference at a fixed location and assuming negligible vertical motion on the lower boundary, the budget equation can also be written

$$P - E = -\frac{\partial \bar{q}}{\partial t} - \overline{\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{V}q)} - \frac{\partial \bar{l}}{\partial t} - \overline{\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{V}l)} \tag{2}$$

in which each substantial time derivative term is expressed as the sum of a local (time) tendency and a horizontal flux divergence. The flux divergence term involving q can itself be divided into two parts:

$$\overline{\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{V}q)} = \underbrace{\overline{\mathbf{V} \cdot \nabla q}}_{A} + \underbrace{\overline{q \nabla \cdot \mathbf{V}}}_{B} \qquad (3)$$

where term (A) is a contribution from horizontal advection of water vapour and term (B) is a contribution from the horizontal wind divergence. The latter is closely related to the profile of vertical velocity within the column, since in a hydrostatic atmosphere $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{V} = -\partial\omega / \partial p$, where $\omega = dp / dt$ is the vertical velocity expressed as the rate of change of pressure on a rising (or sinking) fluid element. On the scale of an individual precipitating cloud element, the latter might be expected to be much larger than either the advective or local tendency term. However, the actual balance observed in practice will depend on the scale resolution characteristics of the analysis or forecast system which provides the estimated values of the 'aerological' variables V and q.

In principle, (2) and (3) can be used to estimate P as a residual term, given measurements of the aerological variables V and q and subject to assumptions such as that E and terms involving l can be neglected. Previous studies based on such a 'budget' approach to precipitation forecasting have highlighted the difficulty of obtaining realistic estimates of P in this way (Peixoto, 1973; Holopainen, 1996). A potentially more successful approach, which is used in many operational NWP models, is to treat P as a prognostic variable rather than a quantity which is diagnosed as a residual term in an approximated moisture balance equation. This involves taking into account the conversion of cloud water into precipitation, which is controlled by complex microphysical processes that cannot be represented explicitly by the model, but are instead parameterised as functions of the prognostic variables carried on the model grid.

However, a prediction of precipitation rate based on these parameterisations with input consisting of variables carried on the model grid generates only the so-called dynamic component of the total precipitation. Even mesoscale NWP and analysis systems cannot explicitly represent convective storms, which typically occur on scales below

those which are resolved by the model grid and which excite dynamical modes which are effectively filtered-out by the model's integration scheme. Instead, the effect of such storms on the larger scale water balance is taken into account implicitly by a paramerisation of sub-grid scale convection, the input to which takes into account the gravitational stability of the model atmosphere as measured by the resolved profiles of temperature and humidity. For the type of model considered here, a useful by-product of this process is a partitioning of the total predicted precipitation (considered as an average over a grid cell) into dynamical (large scale) and convective (unresolved scale) components. The ratio of convective to total predicted precipitation can thus provide important information about the synoptic conditions associated with a particular precipitation event.

A well-formulated NWP model is capable of taking into account complex interactions between flow dynamics and those sources and sinks of latent heating which are associated with condensation and evaporation in the atmosphere. An important property of such model forecasts is that the predicted evolution of the atmospheric state represented by the model is forced to be consistent with those well-established laws of motion and continuity on which the model is based, including, for example, the moisture budget equation (1). In this sense, NWP methods are superior to more empirical or approximate methods which do not necessarily result in consistent relationships between predicted field parameters. On the other hand, operational NWP models generally have to rely on rather crude parameterisations of cloud processes, and this may lead to large errors in the predicted 'precipitation efficiency' of the modelled cloud system. (These parameterisation schemes are the subject of intense research into the physics of clouds and are improving rapidly.) A more obvious limitation is the model's inability to represent explicitly small-scale precipitation events which may be particularly important in the context of flood forecasting.

3. An operational mesoscale NWP model

The operational forecast model used in this study is the mesoscale version of the Meteorological Office Unified Model (Cullen, 1991; Golding, 1990). The Mesoscale Model (MM) is a gridpoint model with a horizontal resolution of approximately 16.8 km, extending over a domain measuring roughly 1500 by 1500 km (fig. 1). The model has a vertical coordinate system which is'terrain-following' at low levels and whose vertical resolution varies from a few tens of metres near the lower boundary to just over one kilometre at a height of 8 km. Initial conditions on the model domain boundaries are taken from a large-scale analysis generated by the limited area (Atlantic sector) version of the Unified Model, but the MM also has its own data assimilation scheme, which is capable of incorporating a wide variety of observational data from surface, upper-air and satellite systems. The version used here can be used to generate forecasts initialised at 00, 06, 12 or 18 UTC, each of which represents a 'data cut-off' time prior to which the model runs (for 3 hours) in data assimilation mode. Forecast variables are output at 15 minutes intervals, including surface precipitation accumulated over the previous 15 minutes. (For verification purposes, the latter are here converted to 15-minute average values of precipitation rate.)

In relation to the prediction of moisture budget parameters, an important component of the MM analysis is the Moisture Observation Pre-processing System (MOPS; Wright, 1993) which uses satellite and radar imagery in combination with surface observations and a short term forecast to generate a three-dimensional analysis of cloud height and cover. The cloud data are then converted to profiles of relative humidity using the MM cloud scheme relationships, which are subsequently assimilated into the Model via its own data assimilation scheme. The MM analysis/forecast system thus incorporates information from a variety of data sources, but only to the extent to which these can impact on scales explicitly resolved by the model basis.

4. Model performance and limitations

Our main objectives in using the MM model for this study are i) to provide a 'benchmark' of predictability for catchment-scale precipitation events and ii) to investigate the relative contributions from different components of the mesoscale moisture budget equation (2) and their sensitivity to varying lead time and initial data.

In relation to i), verification was based on interpolating from the model grid to one with the same spatial resolution centred on the Brue Catchment area (at 51.12°N, 2.45°W; see Moore *et al.*, 1997). The evaluation of moisture budget parameters was based on standard differencing methods applied on the same grid. Simple averaging methods were used to estimate budget parameters over areas larger than that defined by a single grid cell, in order to simulate the effect of degrading model resolution.

In relation to ii), use has been made of data collected during designated HYREX Intensive Observation Periods (IOPs). These were periods of up to 24 hours duration, identified in advance, when significant rainfall was expected to affect the Brue catchment area. During IOPs a range of additional meteorological data were collected to complement the automatic rainguage network in the Brue catchment. These included 3-hourly radiosonde ascents from operational stations and at a site within the Brue catchement.

To illustrate MM model performance, we here show results obtained from the HYREX IOP 3 event, which occurred on 6th/7th December 1994. During this period, a band of moderate frontal (non-convective) precipitation moved from West to East across the British Isles, producing over 20 mm of rainfall in 24 hours over Cornwall. Figure 2 compares MM predictions of surface precipitation rates with catchment-scale averages estimated from the dense gauge network (15-minute averages; see Wood *et al.*, 1997). Results for two MM runs are shown: run (a) is based on an initialisation (data cut-off) time of 1800 on 6th December, which is before a period of intensive (3-hourly) upper air observations made in connection with the experiment; run (b) is based on an initialisation time of 0000 on 7th December, which should be influenced by upper-air

soundings from British radiosonde stations made at 2100 and 0000. At the model resolution, run (a) provides the better prediction of peak rate but substantially over-predicts the total rainfall during the 6-hour period of interest (17.2 mm as against an observed 7.2 mm). Run (b) provides an improved estimate of total rainfall (12.5 mm) but under-estimates peak rainfall rate by a factor of more than two. Although the model prediction of peak precipitation rate is not particularly impressive, it is worth noting that the estimated peak catchment value derived from the FRONTIERS network radar was 4.5 mm hr^{-1}, which also represents an under-estimation of the observed peak rate by more than a factor of two, even though it is based on real-time data. For this particular case, the MM forecast initialised at 1800 UT provides an estimate of peak precipitation rate which is actually closer to the gauged value than one based on the real-time radar data, though the latter did provide a much better estimate of accumulated precipitation (5.2 mm) than either of the MM forecasts.

To a first approximation, the MM predictions of catchment rainfall rate can be considered as 'smoothed' versions of the observed variation, with some offset in the timing of peak rate. Although the horizontal scale of a single gridpoint cell (~17 km) is actually somewhat larger than that characterising the Brue catchment area (~12 km), this difference is not sufficient to explain the observed difference in the time variation in P. Fig. 2 also shows the effect of decreasing spatial resolution, by averaging the model values of P over different numbers of grid cells centred on the Brue catchment area. Reducing resolution by a factor of four has relatively little impact on either the total rainfall amount or duration. This behaviour is consistent with the model tending to over-estimate the width of the main rainband rather than under-estimating its translation velocity. In other words, it appears that the model provides a rather poorer spatial resolution of the observed event than that which might be implied by its own gridpoint resolution scale.

Figure 3 shows the time variation of some of the vertically integrated moisture budget parameters represented in (1) and (2), as derived from the MM model data at gridpoint resolution. The variation in $-D\overline{q}\,/\,Dt$ almost exactly matches that of the model's predicted surface precipitation rate while this is significantly greater than zero,

implying that contributions from evaporation and changes in liquid water concentration in a frame of reference following the main rainband are negligible. Hence the model associates most of the precipitation with the 'aerological' source term $-D\overline{q}/Dt$. In the local frame of reference, the largest contribution is associated with vapour flux convergence $-\nabla\cdot\left(\overline{q\mathbf{V}}\right)$, a large part of which is attributable to the contribution from the horizontal wind convergence term $-\overline{q\nabla\cdot\mathbf{V}}$ (see equation 3). Such a result is consistent with the idea that the model interprets this precipitation event as mainly 'large-scale' (little or no contribution from moist convection on the sub-grid scale), so that the rate at which precipitation is generated within the grid cell is determined mainly by the profiles of vertical velocity and humidity variables carried on the model grid.

A significant feature of the budget time series is the relative insensitivity of the horizontal advection term $-\overline{\mathbf{V}\cdot\nabla q}$ to initial conditions. This result implies the predicted humidity and total horizontal wind fields are not greatly influenced by the impact of additional data during the assimilation period. Furthermore, it turns out that this horizontal term is almost equal and opposite in sign to the (negative) tendency term $-\partial\overline{q}/\partial t$ (not shown). Such a balance is consistent with the idea that the local changes in the total precipitable water content of the atmospheric column are associated mainly with the advection of an airmass transition zone within which the horizontal gradient of humidity changes only slowly in response to the release of precipitation. To a reasonable approximation, it follows that for this particular event the forecast precipitation can be diagnosed directly from the horizontal wind convergence term, in the sense that

$$\langle P\rangle \cong \left\langle -\overline{q\nabla\cdot\mathbf{V}}\right\rangle \equiv \left\langle \overline{q\frac{\partial\omega}{\partial p}}\right\rangle$$

where the braces imply time-averaging over the period of significant precipitation. Such a result could be important in the context of attempting to forecast smaller-scale features using a storm-resolving model: it suggests that it is mainly a realistic 'disaggregation' of the wind field convergence (or, equivalently, vertical velocity) which is required in order to successfully represent the distribution of precipitation on

scales smaller than those resolved explicitly by the mesoscale model, though small scale variations in both the specific and relative humidity should also probably be taken into account for additional accuracy.

Any model attempting to solve the moisture balance equation at high resolution also needs to adequately represent the vertical distribution of the individual aerological source terms. Fig. 4 shows the MM-generated profiles of $-Dq/Dt$, $-q\nabla\cdot\mathbf{V}$ and $-\mathbf{V}\cdot\nabla q$, averaged over a period of four hours centred on the time of maximum predicted precipitation rate. These again emphasise the dominant influence of the predicted wind field convergence in determining the source of precipitation by moisture transport. It is notable that a very large contribution to the horizontal flux convergence is from a relatively shallow layer, the depth of which varies substantially (by nearly 1 km) between the two model runs. This together with a substantial difference in convergence below 1.5 km largely accounts for the total difference in the predicted value of accumulated precipitation.

5. Conclusions

The spatial resolution of current operational NWP models is not sufficient to represent sub-catchment scale precipitation features which may be important for regional flood forecasting. Nevertheless, a mesoscale NWP model of the type described here is capable of assimilating information from a wide variety of data sources in arriving at a solution of the time-dependent moisture budget equation, and should therefore provide important information about the moist dynamical environment within which smaller-scale systems are embedded. Further research is required to determine whether such information can improve the performance of regional 'storm-resolving' models which conventionally rely mainly on assimilating high-resolution observations (such as from radar) in near real time, within the framework of a simplified representation of moist dynamics.

Finally we remark that in the foreseeable future (as computing power continues to increase) it may be possible to run fully deterministic cloud-resolving models. These

will have a formulation similar to that of the MM but operate at a much higher spatial resolution (≤ 1 km) to give explicit sub-catchment scale rainfall predictions. Such models are beginning to be used operationally in the USA (Droegemeier *et al.*, 1996). One difficulty, however, is the availability of initialization data at the appropriate scale, and for this radar will play an obvious role. Until these cloud models can be implemented there is considerable scope for the development of simplified storm models which are capable of combining information about the larger-scale moist environment predicted by a mesoscale forecast with near real-time data provided by radar and other high resolution observing systems.

Acknowledgements

This work forms a contribution to the HYREX project " Methods for short-period precipitation and flow forecasting incorporating radar data" funded by the Natural Environment Research Council under its Special Topic research programme. It was carried out in collaboration with the UK Meteorological Office/University of Reading Joint Centre for Mesoscale Meteorology (JCMM). The authors thank Dr Sid Clough and other members of JCMM for their assistance with the planning and execution of HYREX Intensive Observation Periods, and the Meteorological Office for the provision of additional upper air sounding data.

References

Bell, V.A. and Moore, R.J., (1997) Short period forecasting of catchment-scale precipitation. Part II: a water-balance storm model for short-term rainfall and flood forecasting, *HYREX Special Issue, Hydrology and Earth Systems Science,* to be submitted

Brown, R., Newcomb, P.D., Cheung-Lee, J. and Ryall, G., (1994) Development and evaluation of the forecast step of the FRONTIERS short-term precipitation forecasting system, *J. Hydrol.*, **158**, 79-105.

Cullen, M.J.P., (1991) The unified forecast/climate model, *Meteorol. Mag.*, **122**, 81-94.

Golding, B.W., (1990) The Meteorological Office mesoscale model, *Meteorol. Mag.*, **119**, 81-86.

Droegemeier, K.K., Xue, M., Brewster, K., Liu, Y., Park, S.K., Carr, F.H., Mewes, J., Zong, J., Sathye, A., Bassett, G., Zou, M., Carpetenter, R., McCarthy, D., Andra, D., Janish, P, Graham, R., Sanielvici, S., Brown, J, Loftis, B. and McLain, K. (1996) The 1996 CAPS Spring Operational Forecasting Period: Realtime Storm-Scale NWP, Part 1: Goals and Methodology, *Preprint, 11th Conference on Num. Wea. Pred. 19-23 August 1996, Norfolk, VA, American Meteorological Society.*

Golding, B.W., (1997) A system for generating automated very short range forecasts, to appear in *Met. Apps.*

Heise, E., (1996) An investigation of water and energy budgets for the BALTEX region based on short-range numerical predictions, *Tellus*, **48A**, 693-707.

Holopainen, E., (1996) Diagnostic studies on atmospheric budgets of water and energy based on aerological data, *Tellus*, 48A, 750-755.

Karstens, U., Nolte-Holube, R. and Rockel, R., (1996) Calculation of the water budget over the Baltic Sea Catchment area using the reional forecast model REMO for June 1993, *Tellus*, 48A, 684-692.

Moore, R.J., Jones, D.A. and Cox, D.A., (1997) The design of the HYdrological Radar EXperiment (HYREX), *HYREX Special Issue, Hydrology and Earth Systems Science*, to be submitted.

Peixoto, J.P., (1973) *Atmospheric vapour flux computations for hydrological purposes*, WMO Report No 20 on WMO/IHD Project (WMO No 357), 83 pp.

Wright, B.J., (1993) The Moisture Observation Pre-processing System (MOPS), *UK Meteorological Office, Forecasting Research Division, Technical Report No 38.*

Wood, S.J., Jones, D.A. and Moore, R.J., (1997) Measurement of rainfall over scales of hydrological interest, *HYREX Special Issue, Hydrology and Earth Systems Science*, to be submitted.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

FIGURE 1 The mesoscale model gridpoint domain. Upper panel shows the horizontal domain with gridpoint resolution 16.8 km. Lower panel shows the distribution of model levels in (vertical) pressure coordinate space for a typical East-West section across the model domain.

FIGURE 2 Comparisons between MM predicted and observed precipitation rates over the period 2200 6 December 1994 to 0400 7 December 1994 (HYREX IOP3): a) data assimilation cut-off time 1800; b) data assimilation cut-off time 0000. Continuous line is observed rate averaged over the Brue Catchment area (15 minute averages). Other lines join predicted values at model resolution (16.8 km; dotted), averaged over a 64 km by 64 km area (dashed) and averaged over a 128 km by 128 km area (dot-dash).

FIGURE 3 Column integral time series of MM moisture budget parameters $-Dq/Dt$ (continuous curve), $-\mathbf{V}\cdot\nabla q$ (dashed curve), $-q\nabla\cdot\mathbf{V}$ (dot-dash curve) and $-\nabla\cdot(q\mathbf{V})$ (dotted curve). Panels a) and b) refer to different MM runs, as in fig. 2.

FIGURE 4 Vertical profiles of model predicted moisture budget parameters $-Dq/Dt$ (continuous curve), $-q\nabla\cdot\mathbf{V}$ (dashed curve) and $-\mathbf{V}\cdot\nabla q$ (dot-dash curve), averaged over a 4-hour period centred on the time of maximum predicted precipitation rate. Panels a) and b) refer to different MM runs, as in fig.1.


Horizontal section from Unified Model
60
55
50
Latitude
−10
−5
0
5
Longitude


MESOSCALE 28 Levels (Moist levels)
Pressure mb
50
100
150
200
250
300
350
400
450
500
550
600
650
700
750
800
850
900
950
1000
1050
1
14
27
40
53
66
79
92
X−Index

FIG1


a
Precipitation (mm/hour)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
2.5
3.0
3.5
4.0
4.5
5.0
5.5
6.0
Elapsed time (hours)

FIG 2a


b
Precipitation rate (mm/hour)
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
2.5
3.0
3.5
4.0
4.5
5.0
5.5
6.0
Elapsed time (hours)

FIG 2b


a
10
8
6
4
2
0
-2
Contribution (mm/hr)
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
2.5
3.0
3.5
4.0
4.5
5.0
5.5
6.0
Elapsed time (hours)

FIG 3a


b
10
8
6
4
2
0
-2
Contribution (mm/hr)
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
2.5
3.0
3.5
4.0
4.5
5.0
5.5
6.0
Elapsed time (hours)

FIG 3b


a
height (km)
10
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0
-100
-80
-60
-40
-20
0
20
Contribution (10**-5 g (kg s)**-1)

Fig 4a


b
height (km)
10
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0
-100
-80
-60
-40
-20
0
20
Contribution (10**-5 g (kg s)**-1)

Fig 4b

CURRENT JCMM INTERNAL REPORTS

This series of JCMM Internal Reports, initiated in 1993, contains unpublished reports and also versions of articles submitted for publication. The complete set of Internal Reports is available from the National Meteorological Library on loan, if required.

1. **Research Strategy and Programme**
   K A Browning et al
   January 1993

2. **The GEWEX Cloud System Study (GCSS)**
   GEWEX Cloud System Science Team
   January 1993

3. **Evolution of a mesoscale upper tropospheric vorticity maximum and comma cloud from a cloud-free two dimensional potential vorticity anomaly**
   K A Browning
   January 1993

4. **The Global Energy and Water Cycle**
   K A Browning
   July 1993

5. **Structure of a midlatitude cyclone before occlusion**
   K A Browning and N Roberts
   July 1993

6. **Development in Systems and Tools for Weather Forecasting**
   K A Browning and G Szejwach
   July 1993

7. **Diagnostic study of a narrow cold frontal rainband and severe winds associated with a stratospheric intrusion**
   K A Browning and R Reynolds
   August 1993

8. **Survey of perceived priority issues in the parametrizations of cloud-related processes in GCMs**
   K A Browning
   September 1993

9. **The Effect of Rain on Longwave Radiation**
   I Dharssi
   September 1993

10. **Physical Cloud Microprocesses - A Description of the Parametrization used in the Large Eddy Model**
    H Swann
    July 1994

11. **An Appreciation of the Meteorological Research of Ernst Kleinschmidt**
A J Thorpe
May 1992

12. **Potential Vorticity of Flow Along the Alps**
A J Thorpe, H Volkert and Dietrich Heimann
August 1992

13. **The Representation of Fronts**
A J Thorpe
January 1993

14. **A Parametrization Scheme for Symmetric Instability: Test for an Idealised Flow**
C S Chan and A J Thorpe
February 1993

15. **The Fronts 92 Experiment: a Quicklook Atlas**
Edited by T D Hewson
November 1993

16. **Frontal wave stability during moist deformation frontogenesis**
Part 1. Linear wave dynamics
C H Bishop and A J Thorpe
May 1993

17. **Frontal wave stability during moist deformation frontogenesis**
Part 2. The suppression of non-linear wave development
C H Bishop and A J Thorpe
May 1993

18. **Gravity waves in sheared ducts**
C Bishop and A J Thorpe
November 1993

19. **Potential Vorticity and the Electrostatics Analogy: Quasi-Geostrophic Theory**
C Bishop and A J Thorpe
November 1993

20. **Recent Advances in the Measurement of Precipitation by Radar**
A J Illingworth - April 1993

21. **Micro-Physique et Givrage. Cloud Microphysics and Aircraft Icing**
A J Illingworth May 1993

22. **Differential Phase Measurements of Precipitation**
M Blackman and A J Illingworth
May 1993

23. **Estimation of Effective Radius of Cloud Particles from the Radar Reflectivity**
N I Fox and A J Illingworth
May 1993

24. **A Simple Method of Dopplerising a Pulsed Magnetron Radar**
A Hau, A J Illingworth and J Eastment
November 1993

25. **Radiation and Polar Lows**
George C Craig
February 1994

26. **Collected preprints submitted to the International Symposium on the Life Cycles of Extratropical Cyclones; Bergen, Norway, 27 June - 1 July 1994**
April 1994

27. **Convective Frontogenesis**
Douglas J Parker and Alan J Thorpe
April 1994

28. **Improved Measurement of the Ice Water Content in Cirrus Using a Total Water Evaporator**
Philip R A Brown and Peter N Francis
April 1994

29. **Mesoscale Effects of a Dry Intrusion within a Vigorous Cyclone**
K A Browning and B W Golding
April 1994

30. **GEWEX Cloud System Study, Science Plan**
May 1994

31. **Parametrization of Momentum Transport by Convectively Generated Gravity Waves**
R Kershaw
February 1995

32. **Mesoscale Modelling Newsletter No 5**
May 1994

33. **Observations of the mesoscale sub-structure in the cold air of a developing frontal cyclone**
K A Browning, S A Clough, C S A Davitt, N M Roberts and T D Hewson
May 1994

34. **Longwave Radiative Forcing of a Simulated Tropical Squall Line**
Imtiaz Dharssi
July 1994

35. **On the nature of the convective circulation at a kata-cold front**
K A Browning
September 1994

36. **Collective preprints of papers submitted to the COST-75 International Seminar on Advanced Weather Radar Systems, Brussels, 20-23 September 1994**
November 1994

37. **Use of satellite imagery to diagnose events leading to frontal thunderstorms: Parts 1 and 11 of a case study**
K A Browning and N M Roberts
November 1994

38. **The role of spaceborne millimetre-wave radar in the global monitoring of ice cloud**
P R A Brown, A J Illingworth, A J Heymsfield, G M McFarquahar, K A Browning and M Gosset
December 1994

39. **Potential Vorticity Inversion**
Michael Ziemianski
October 1994

40. **Theory of mature tropical cyclones; a comparison between Kleinschmidt (1951) and Emanuel (1986)**
Suzanne L Gray
December 1994

41. **Dispersion and removal of pollutants during the passage of an atmospheric frontal System**
N R Gimson
December 1994

42. **The role of snow sublimation in frontogenesis**
D J Parker and A J Thorpe
December 1994

43. **Potential vorticity and the electrostatics Analogy: Ertel- Rossby formulation**
A J Thorpe and C H Bishop
December 1994

44. **Mesoscale aspect of extratropical cyclones: an observational perspective**
K A Browning
January 1995

45. **A Polar Low Outbreak: Evolution and Mesoscale Structures**
T D Hewson, G C Craig and C Claud
February 1995

46. **Generation of near-surface gusts of deep convection**
K Nakamura and R Kershaw
April 1995

47. **Attribution Concepts applied to the Omega Equation**
S A Clough, C S A Davitt and A J Thorpe
June 1995

48. **Parametrization of mixed-phase cloud and precipitation**
Susan P Ballard and M Gerard Hutchinson
June 1995

49. **Short-range forecasting of stratocumulus: Initialization Prediction**
Susan Ballard, Simon D Jackson and B Macpherson
June 1995

50. **Contributions of the JCMM/Dept of Meteorology Radar Group to the 27th AMS Radar Meteorology Conference, Vail October 1995**
June 1995

51. **Cold Pools in Shear**
Douglas J Parker
September 1995

52. **High-resolution analysis of frontal fracture**
K A Browning, S P Ballard and C S A Davitt
September 1995

53. **The Albedo of Broken Cloud Fields: Calculations using a modified two stream radiation code**
Imtiaz Dharssi and Roy Kershaw
October 1995

54. **Parametrization of momentum transport by convection. I: Theory and cloud modelling results**
P Kershaw and D Gregory
November 1995

55. **Variation of frontal structure along a cold front**
K A Browning and N M Roberts
November 1995

56. **Secondary Frontal Waves**
Douglas Parker
December 1995

57. **Objective Fronts**
T D Hewson
March 1996

58. **Mesoscale analysis of the activation of a cold front during cyclogenesis**
K A Browning, N M Roberts and A J Illingworth
June 1996

59. **Investigation of Different Representations of Rain in a 1-d Evaporation Model**
H Swann
May 1996

60. **Parametrization of diabatic processes in the inversion of the omega-equation**
M Athanassiadou and A J Thorpe

61. **The Role of the Environmental Flow in the Development of Secondary Frontal Cyclones**
I A Renfrew, A J Thorpe and A Joly
June 1996

62. **Consequences of the geostrophic momentum approximation on barotropic instability**
S Malardel, A J Thorpe and A Joly
June 1996

63. **Contributions to the AMS/RMS Conference on Mesoscale Processes**
Reading, 9-13 September 1996

64. **Vorticity and Potential Vorticity in Stratified Flows Interacting with an Isolated Obstacle**
Jorge A Gutierrez and A J Thorpe
September 1996

65. **Triple Point Development: Two Case Studies**
Douglas Parker
September 1996

66. **Radar observations of wind-shear splitting within evolving atmospheric Kelvin-Helmholtz billows**
D Chapman and K A Browning
April 1997

67. **Cold Frontal Structure derived from radar wind profilers**
K A Browning, D Jerrett, J Nash, T Oakley, N M Roberts
May 1997

68. **The dry intrusion and its effect on the frontal, cloud and precipitation structure of extratropical cyclones**
K A Browning - Text of invited special lecture at the Spring Conference of the Meteorological Society of Japan, University of Tsukuba, 22 May 1997

69. **Met. Office Unified Model data, diagnostic graphics programs, and other observational data available from the JCMM through the aegis of the Universities Weather Research Network UWERN.** Plus supplement.
Peter Panagi and Ed Dicks
June 1997

70. **Contributions of the JCMM/Dept of Meteorology Radar Group to 28th AMS Radar Meteorology Conference.** Austin, Texas, September 1997

71. **Sensitivity of short-range weather forecasts to local potential vorticity modifications**
Meral Demirtas and Alan Thorpe
July 1997

72. **Objective identification of frontal wave cyclones**
T D Hewson
August 1997

73. **Attribution and its application to mesoscale structure associated with tropopause folds**
A J Thorpe
September 1997

74. **The Role of the Environmental Flow in the Development of Secondary Frontal Cyclones**
Ian A Renfrew, Alan J Thorpe and Craig H Bishop
September 1997

75. **Potential Vorticity: A short history of its definitions and uses**
Alan J Thorpe and Hans Volkert
September 1997

76. **Superposing Semi-Geostrophic Potential Vorticity Anomalies**
H R Birkett and A J Thorpe
September 1997

77. **Short period forecasting of catchment-scale precipitation. Part 1: the role of Numerical Weather Prediction**
M A Pedder, M Haile and A J Thorpe
September 1997

Met Office Joint Centre for Mesoscale Meteorology Department of Meteorology
University of Reading PO Box 243 Reading RG6 6BB United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)118 931 8425 Fax: +44 (0)118 931 8791
www.metoffice.com